

removed to appendices following the text. The report is practically a case book of university library problems. It will certainly be used extensively for many years by interested librarians and by the faculty and administration responsible for the development of the University of Florida Library.—*Peyton Hurt, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.*

Report of a Survey of the University of Georgia Library for the University of Georgia, September-December, 1938. Louis R. Wilson, Harvie Branscomb, Ralph M. Dunbar, and Guy R. Lyle, on behalf of the American Library Association. American Library Association, 1939. 74p. \$1. (Mimeographed)

THIS REPORT presents the results of the first of three surveys of state university libraries conducted by the American Library Association during the last year. It is important as the report of a pioneer appraisal of a university library by an American Library Association committee and for its emphasis upon local problems and local needs as evaluative criteria.

A library survey is rarely a research study. With a program of action the end product of the survey, missionary zeal almost inevitably makes disinterested objectivity impossible, and perhaps, at the present stage of measurement in librarianship, undesirable. The immediate function of an American Library Association survey is evaluation; the final objective a program of improvement. Evaluation necessitates standards—"measuring sticks." The standards most relevant in any library survey are local optima, in so far as they can be determined. The survey committee, under the chairmanship of Dean Wilson, gave unusually careful at-

tention to the local scene—the regional and local environment of the university library.

The committee, in effect, sought answers to three questions: 1. What should be the contribution of the university library to the educational and research program of the University of Georgia? 2. In what specific respects is the university library falling short of optimum fulfillment of its obligations? 3. What specific steps need to be taken to make university library service more consistent with the library needs of the university?

Of the three questions the first is the most difficult, particularly to an outside committee, and least adequately dealt with. A satisfactory answer can be evolved only over a period of years and by the staff of the university itself. Comparisons with other universities and with norms are useful chiefly as corroborative evidence and for "sales" purposes. While the committee recognized this limitation, it was forced by the lack of better measuring devices to seek answers to all three questions largely in terms of comparisons.

The chief value of the report to other surveyors, as well as to the University of Georgia, however, lies in its analysis of local needs in relation to local objectives. This analysis involves a large element of subjective judgment—opinions of the committee, the faculty, and the student body. The resulting evaluation leaves little doubt in the mind of this reviewer as to its essential accuracy. Deficiencies were not difficult to find. The same techniques would almost certainly result in less convincing conclusions if applied to a more highly developed library.

The survey committee is to be commended for a thorough and realistic re-

port, which should prove invaluable to future surveyors—in fact already has provided the basic pattern for two other university library surveys.—*G. Flint Purdy, Wayne University, Detroit.*

Reading in General Education; an Exploratory Study. William S. Gray, ed. American Council on Education, Washington, 1940. xii + 464pp. \$2.50.

THAT reading cannot be regarded as a tool or facility which is acquired in elementary school and to which no further attention need be given has been emphasized by numerous studies in recent years. It now seems clear that the development of the art of reading must occupy the attention of elementary, high-school, and college teachers, and likewise of public, school, and college librarians.

Many specific phases of the problem of reading are still under investigation. The present collection of eleven thorough and well-documented studies by both teachers and librarians is intended to be "an intensive, critical study of the present status, recent trends, and current issues in reading, with special reference to high schools and junior colleges, and to identify problems that are in urgent need of further investigation." It constitutes the report of the Subcommittee on Reading in General Education of the Committee on Measurement and Guidance of the American Council on Education. Funds were supplied by the General Education Board.

The individual studies are quite specialized and reflect, of course, the particular interests of the specialists who have prepared them. For this reason some of them will be of greater interest to librarians than others, even though it might be difficult to select any as in-

trinsically more important or more valuable than others.

After a rather general statement by Neal M. Cross concerning the responsibility of teachers in developing satisfactory reading programs, entitled "Social Change, General Education, and Reading," William S. Gray analyzes the various interpretations of the term "reading" and the factors that influence the reading act. This second study, "Reading and Factors Influencing Reading Efficiency," stresses the importance of continuing the search for needed facts and using these facts in developing greater reading efficiency.

In the third study, "Relation of Reading to Other Forms of Learning," Edgar Dale considers reading in its relation to the various other methods of communicating experience (pictures, radio, etc.) that may be used in general education. Louis C. Zahner, in "Approach to Reading through Analysis of Meanings," suggests the creation of a central institute like the Orthological Institute in London to carry on and coordinate research in the teaching of reading, while Bernice E. Leary and William S. Gray, in "Reading Problems in Content Fields," indicate certain practices and procedures that teachers may follow in guiding the improvement of reading in any field.

The sixth study, "American Culture and the Teaching of Literature," by Lou L. LaBrant, will be of general interest, but librarians will be particularly interested in the following study, "Reading Interests and Tastes," by Harold A. Anderson, since it touches on the problem not only of stimulating interest in reading but of developing tastes for good reading.

Studies eight, nine, and ten, "Difficulties in Reading Material," by Bernice